

1 forwarded the results of her review to Teri Thompson, Director of Classification and Compensation.
2 By letter dated October 1, 2001, Ms. Thompson notified Appellant that his position was properly
3 allocated to the Carpenter classification. On October 26, 2001, Appellant filed exceptions to the
4 Director's determination with the Personnel Appeals Board. Appellant's exceptions are the subject
5 of this proceeding.

6
7 Appellant is the only Carpenter at the SSCC campus. SSCC campus services staff is responsible for
8 the majority of the construction and remodeling jobs on campus. Staff are assigned to work on
9 projects based on their skills and areas of expertise. Rick Deering, Maintenance Mechanic, is
10 frequently assigned to work with Appellant, however, Mr. Deering is not a journey-level carpenter.
11 Both Appellant and Mr. Deering report directly to Eric Steen, Maintenance Supervisor.

12
13 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant contends that Mr. Deering is a full-time employee
14 and is assigned to work with him almost daily. Therefore, Appellant asserts that he provides lead
15 direction to Mr. Deering. Appellant argues that Mr. Deering does journey-level carpentry work,
16 that he taught Mr. Deering how to use carpentry equipment and tools, and that he oversees and
17 directs Mr. Deering's work on a day-to-day basis. Appellant argues that his position meets the
18 intent of the Carpenter Lead classification because leading and instructing Mr. Deering is a major
19 part of his job.

20
21 In addition, Appellant argues that SSCC failed to respond to his request for reallocation within 60
22 days as required by WAC 251-06-060(2). Appellant contends that SSCC must comply with the
23 rule, that they failed to do so, and that they must be held accountable.

24
25 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent acknowledges that Mr. Deering was assigned
26 to help Appellant on numerous projects and that they worked well together as a team. Respondent

1 argues that it was not unusual for projects to last several weeks and contends that there was no need
2 to make a work assignment every single morning for the duration of the projects. However, the
3 college contends that Mr. Deering was not permanently assigned to work with Appellant and that
4 Mr. Deering could be called away by his supervisor to work on other projects at any time.
5 Respondent asserts that Mr. Deering's expertise was in mechanical, heating/ventilation/air
6 conditioning, and plumbing, and that he did not do journey-level carpentry work. Respondent
7 argues that Appellant's position does not meet the distinguishing characteristics of the Carpenter
8 Lead classification because he is not responsible to lead a journey-level carpenter.

9
10 Respondent admits that the college failed to respond to Appellant's request for reallocation within
11 60 days as required by WAC 251-60-060(2).

12
13 **Primary Issue.** Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's position was properly
14 allocated to the Carpenter classification should be affirmed.

15
16 **Relevant Classifications.** Carpenter, class code 5330, and Carpenter Lead, class code 5331.

17
18 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best
19 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a
20 measurement of the volume of work performed nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that
21 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in
22 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular
23 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the
24 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.
25 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

1 The definition of the Carpenter Lead classification states, "[l]ead and work with carpenters to
2 perform journey-level carpentry work." The distinguishing characteristic state, "[p]ositions in this
3 class are distinguished by responsibility to lead journey carpenters on a project or at a job location,
4 to instruct other assigned workers, to correct and specify methods, and to perform skilled carpentry
5 repair and fabrication work."

6
7 Appellant does not lead or work with journey-level carpenters. Mr. Deering is a maintenance
8 mechanic, not a journey-level carpenter.

9
10 Appellant performs journey-level carpentry work in the maintenance, repair and construction of
11 college facilities. Appellant's position is fully encompassed by the Carpenter classification.
12 Furthermore, the typical work statements for Carpenter classification include, "[m]ay lead and
13 instruct helpers as required." Mr. Deering functions as a helper to Appellant. Therefore,
14 Appellant's responsibility for leading and instructing Mr. Deering falls within the Carpenter
15 classification.

16
17 It is undisputed that Respondent failed to comply with the requirement of WAC 251-06-060(2).
18 The appropriate remedy would have been to order the college to complete the review and to comply
19 with the rule in the future. In this case, Respondent has completed the review. Misallocating
20 Appellant's position as a remedy to a rule violation is not appropriate. However, Respondent is
21 directed to comply with the time requirements of WAC 251-60-060(2) when responding to future
22 reallocation requests.

23
24 **Conclusion.** Appellant's appeal on exceptions should be denied and the determination of the
25 Director, dated October 1, 2001, should be affirmed.

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellant is denied and the Director's determination, dated October 1, 2001, is affirmed and adopted. A copy is attached.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2002.

WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

Gerald L. Morgen, Vice, Chair